

A STUDY OF FAMILIAL FACTORS OF FAMILIES WITH  
CHILDREN ELIGIBLE FOR AN  
ENRICHMENT PROGRAM

By

SUZANNE ADELE PERSSON

Bachelor of Science

Oklahoma State University

Stillwater, Oklahoma

1964

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of  
the Oklahoma State University  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of  
MASTER OF SCIENCE  
May, 1966

JUN 10 1966

A STUDY OF FAMILIAL FACTORS OF FAMILIES WITH  
CHILDREN ELIGIBLE FOR AN  
ENRICHMENT PROGRAM

Thesis Approved:

Stanley E. Fowler  
Thesis Adviser  
Josephine Hoffer  
J. H. B. B. B.  
Dean of the Graduate School

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to express sincere appreciation to those persons whose cooperation made this study possible.

The author extends sincere appreciation to her major adviser, Dr. Stanley S. Fowler, for this interest, competent guidance, and patience throughout this study. The writer expresses deep gratitude to Dr. Josephine Hoffer for her guidance, as well as her warm interest and encouragement in the presentation of this study.

Acknowledgment is also made to the Stillwater Public School System and to all the women who took part in this study for their cooperation in the obtaining of data.

The writer is indebted to her family for their understanding and encouragement throughout her graduate study.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION. . . . .	1
Statement of Problem . . . . .	1
Statement of Purpose . . . . .	2
Definition of Terms. . . . .	2
II. LITERATURE RELATED TO THE PROBLEM . . . . .	4
Importance of Family and Environmental Factors . . .	4
Characteristics of the Culturally Deprived . . . . .	6
Working with Culturally Deprived Parents . . . . .	7
Summary. . . . .	10
III. METHODS AND PROCEDURES. . . . .	12
Purpose. . . . .	12
Hypotheses to be Tested. . . . .	12
Subjects in this Study . . . . .	13
Selection of Sample. . . . .	14
Development of Interview Schedule. . . . .	15
Procedure of Data Collection . . . . .	17
IV. ANALYSIS OF DATA. . . . .	19
Mobility Patterns. . . . .	19
Occupational Level of Parents. . . . .	21
Annual Family Income . . . . .	22
Educational Attainment of Parents. . . . .	23
Housing Conditions . . . . .	24
Sources of Information . . . . .	25
Initial Contact Regarding Project Head Start. . . .	26
Summary. . . . .	27
V. SUMMARY . . . . .	29
Findings . . . . .	29
Implications . . . . .	31
Recommendations for Further Research . . . . .	32

Chapter	Page
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY. . . . .	33
OTHER SOURCES. . . . .	36
APPENDIXES . . . . .	37
Appendix A . . . . .	38
Appendix B . . . . .	40
Appendix C . . . . .	49
Appendix D . . . . .	51

# LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Mobility Patterns of Families of Children Eligible for Stillwater Project Head Start, Summer of 1965 . . . . .	20
II. Occupational Level of Parents of Children Eligible for Stillwater Project Head Start, Summer of 1965 . . . . .	21
III. Annual Family Income of Families of Children Eligible for Stillwater Project Head Start, Summer of 1965 . . . . .	22
IV. Educational Attainment of Parents of Children Eligible for Stillwater Project Head Start, Summer of 1965 . . . . .	23
V. Housing Conditions of Families with Children Eligible for Stillwater Project Head Start, Summer of 1965 . . . . .	24
VI. Availability of Sources of Information in Families of Children Eligible for Stillwater Project Head Start, Summer of 1965. . . . .	25
VII. Initial Contact Regarding Project Head Start of Families of Children Eligible for the Stillwater Project, Summer of 1965 . . . . .	26
VIII. Description of Sample . . . . .	52
IX. Child Care Patterns in Families of Children Eligible for Stillwater Project Head Start, Summer of 1965 . . . . .	55
X. Availability of Outdoor Play Space to Families of Children Eligible for Stillwater Project Head Start, Summer of 1965. . . . .	55

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

#### Statement of Problem

Within the past ten years, there has been increasing concern with the problem of providing the maximum educational opportunity for children from environmentally and culturally disadvantaged families. New York City, Baltimore, Maryland, and New Haven, Connecticut are among some of the Eastern cities which have included in their school systems an enrichment program for those children considered to be culturally deprived. A national enrichment program has been designed as an extension of President Johnson's 'War on Poverty', the Head Start Project of 1965. These programs provide opportunities to enrich the background of experiences of the children from culturally deprived families.

There has been an emphasis in all of these programs on orienting the teachers of disadvantaged children to the goals, values, and problems which are particular to this group of people. Too often, the teachers and administrators have preconceived misconceptions and stereotypes of the family in a depressed area. What are the culturally deprived families in "our community" really like? What can be learned from a community study of why some enroll their children in an enrichment program, i.e., Head Start, and others do not? What needs to be

understood of the culturally deprived family that would be of service to ongoing programs in enlisting a larger percentage of those who are eligible?

These questions served as a basis to the present study as they are some of the questions which confront educators in evaluating and planning these enrichment programs.

#### Statement of Purpose

The purpose of this study was to describe and analyze the familial factors of those families who were eligible for and who enrolled their child in the Stillwater Project Head Start with those families who were eligible but did not enroll their child in the Project.

#### Definition of Terms

The following terms were defined to clarify their use in this study:

1. Culturally deprived. Throughout this study, culturally deprived, disadvantaged, and underprivileged were used interchangeably. They refer to families with: substandard housing, low level of formal education, and low level of family income.
2. Eligibility for Project Head Start. Officially, children in families who meet these criteria were eligible for participation in the Stillwater enrichment program: children who would be six years of age by November 1, 1965; family annual income of \$3,000 or less if there were three or four members in the family---for each additional dependent \$300 more income was allowed.



At least 85% of those children in Project Head Start must meet the above criteria. It should be noted however, that this was loosely interpreted in Stillwater due to an apparent early shortage of children meeting these criteria.

## CHAPTER II

### LITERATURE RELATED TO THE PROBLEM

#### Importance of Family and Environmental Factors

Jacques Barzun (1), in the House of Intellect, called attention to the unearned advantage of ancestry and of being born to the elite.

There is no mystery about it: the child who is familiar with books, ideas, conversation--the ways and means of the intellectual life--before he begins school, indeed, before he begins consciously to think, has a marked advantage. He is at home in the House of Intellect just as the stable boy is at home among horses or the child of actors on the stage. Medical schools recognize this truth when they give preference to applicants who are children of physicians. (p. 142).

Sawrey and Telford (25) stressed that the socio-economic status of a family has various implications for development of children within the home setting.

Children coming from homes of higher socio-economic status not only are apt to have come from more brilliant parents initially, but also to have had provided for them better opportunities for development intellectually, physically, and emotionally. We have here operative not only favorable heredity but also stimulating environment that continues to favor intellectual growth. (p. 294).

There is a very strong tendency for children to develop in the image of their parents, indeed, into the same position or social class as their parents. The home, as the foundation for the rest of one's life, may be an enriching environment and a source of special advantages or it may close all doors and shut out opportunity. (27).

Conant, in Slums and Suburbs (3), described the importance of the

role of the community and family background in determining scholastic aptitude and school achievement. Inherently, the potential ability of deprived children is no different from other children. If the educational opportunities are equal for all children then, Conant contended, the poor achievement of children in both the Negro and white slums was the result of their depressing cultural and socio-economic background.

Conant (3) indicated that "to a considerable degree, what a school should do and can do is determined by the status and ambition of the families being served." (p. 25). He noted that we can help these children if we can induce the parents to adopt a positive attitude toward the school.

In Elmtown's Youth, Hollingshead (18) reported that the class to which a child belongs is a significant factor in his relations with the school. Students from the lower classes made significantly poorer adjustments in scholastic achievements.

Brazziel and Terrel (2) studied the development of readiness in a culturally disadvantaged group of first grade Negro children in Millington, Tennessee. They discussed the plight of the disadvantaged child.

The child from a disadvantaged home comes to school slightly less prepared in both literacy and social learnings than will his more fortunate middle or upper income counterpart. This is evidenced by a gradual decrease in intelligence and achievement test scores as the child moves through school. By the Junior year in high school he is expected to lose 15 to 20 points in intelligence and be two to three years behind in school. (p. 4).

Deutsch (7) stated that reduced environmental stimulation, as it exists in slum areas, affects the ability of the child to respond to his environment. Passow (29) described the effects of the culturally

deprived family on the child's school achievement.

Many children from families of low socio-economic status do not reach their maximum achievement level in the ordinary school program. Handicapped by culturally impoverished homes that lack an educational tradition, they often record scores on tests of mental ability that do not reveal their full intellectual potential. Nor do such children usually match the academic achievement demonstrated by their more privileged fellow pupils of comparable ability. (p. 99).

Eells, in Intelligence and Cultural Differences (10), pointed out that although the deprived children use a great many words with a fair amount of precision these are not the words used in school. Success in school is based on proficiency with a middle-class vocabulary, not with the language of the underprivileged.

The Educational Policies Commission of the National Education Association (9) reported that the educative process is greatly complicated for the child whose home is characterized by "poverty, disease, instability, or conflict." (p. 9).

#### Characteristics of the Culturally Deprived

Culturally deprived families typically live in deteriorating neighborhoods where the housing is described as being of low quality and maintenance. (24, 27). Census tract data of these neighborhoods would more than likely indicate high population density per block and per dwelling unit. (8, 15). This may be explained by the prevalence of multi-unit dwellings, apartments, or overcrowded living conditions. (3, 5, 7, 24). Keller (19) described the over-crowded housing conditions in an underprivileged area of New York City by showing the average number of persons per room to be two.

According to Deutsch (7) and Conant (3), culturally deprived

families tend to show a high proportion of untrained adults who were unemployed or had low paying jobs. The evidence of inadequate education and job training may be observed in the lower paying occupations available to these parents and the resulting cultural disadvantage so prevalent in slum areas. (18, 27). A probable explanation of this is the limited educational achievement of the parents. Conant (3), Deutsch (7), Riessman (24), and Sexton (27), indicated that low educational attainment, low status occupations, and low paying jobs were interdependent and played significant roles in determining the level of the other. Poverty in the parental home may force the son or daughter to quit school at an early age--this limits their educational level and earning capacity. From generation to generation this pattern may be the legacy from parents to offspring.

Hollingshead (18, p. 335) reported that the most significant factor in an adolescent's continuing or dropping out of school was the family's formal educational experience. The parents of the high school graduates tended to have graduated from high school while the parents of the drop-outs usually terminated school attendance somewhere before the second year of high school.

According to Conant (3), Sexton (27), and Fusco (14), one of the most important characteristics of the families is their high mobility rate. Sexton referred to this pattern as damaging to school achievement because the child often does not finish one school term in the same place he began.

#### Working with Culturally Deprived Parents

Allan Hartman (15), Director of Preschool and Primary Education

Project, Pennsylvania Department of Public Education, in 1964, found that in organizing programs throughout the state for culturally deprived there was a problem in the recruitment of children. These parents seemed to be unaffected by the usual avenues of communication. Letters, telephone calls, and other media of publicity drew only a few participants. Parents and their children were brought to the school as a result of direct personal contact in the home.

Fusco (14) discussed the fallacy in the idea that culturally deprived parents are unwilling and unable to support the efforts made at school. He emphasized that "Most parents are willing and eager to help their child succeed in school. It is their knowledge and experience for carrying out this responsibility that is deficient." (p. 56). Understanding this concept, Fusco stated, is necessary in developing successful home-school relationships.

Sexton (27) discussed the importance of working directly with culturally deprived parents to secure their cooperation and interest.

The school must seek the help and cooperation of parents if they want to change the behavior of students. Involving culturally deprived parents in school affairs, will require much more than written invitations or a sharp complaining phone call from the principal about their child's behavior. It will require warm encouragement, school activities that are interesting, and programs that make sense. (pp. 111-112).

Fusco (14) published the results of a study of the practices being used in Baltimore, Maryland; Chicago, Illinois; Detroit, Michigan; Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; and St. Louis, Missouri to improve home-school relations. The administrative procedures typically included orienting the staff to the problems of the culturally deprived, providing inservice training, developing specific objectives from which to

teach, assigning staff responsibilities and gathering information on home and neighborhood conditions. In the surveys of home and family conditions, efforts were made to identify quantitative and qualitative factors concerning family and home life which might adversely affect the pupil's learning, social attitudes, and emotional adjustment in the school setting. The staff were encouraged to visit in the homes of their pupils. These face-to-face contacts provided opportunity for gaining insight into the home conditions and developing rapport with parents.

Teachers training in the Greater Detroit School Improvement Program (29, p. 282) participated in an orientation to modify their perceptions of the background and scholastic potential of the culturally deprived child.

New York City (12), under the auspices of the City Department of Health, used the survey method to evaluate the magnitude and scope of family day care problems in New York City. The interviewer followed a questionnaire to systematically obtain information on the age, sex, race, marital status, income, educational level and occupational status of the parents, and the mobility of the family. By observation, the interviewer recorded an evaluation of the housekeeping, housing facilities and conditions, play space available, toys and playthings, and reading material available.

The Early School Admissions Project in Baltimore, Maryland (8), as well as the Pre-Kindergarten Program in New Haven, Connecticut (13), collected information on the home backgrounds of each pupil in a home interview by the teacher with each mother.

The Wichita, Kansas Survey (30) was concerned with measuring the problems of day care in Wichita and the advantages and disadvantages of three different approaches to people. Three samples of population were studied. First, the residential survey consisted of an interview in the home of mothers chosen at random from an address list. Second, in the school survey, parents of children enrolled in elementary and intermediate schools were asked to complete a questionnaire. The industrial survey was the third method studied. Women employed in business establishments representative of every occupation of women in Wichita were asked to complete a questionnaire.

In analyzing the results, it was found that the first sample described, the residential sample, was more accurate than the school questionnaire and the industrial survey. The residential sampling techniques were also the most expensive and least efficient as far as money and time was concerned. (30).

#### Summary

The review of literature indicated the importance of the family and home environment in the full development of a child's potential ability and skill.

Culturally deprived families were identified by:

1. High mobility
2. Low annual income, derived from low status jobs requiring little or no skill
3. Overcrowded housing of substandard quality in "poor" to "very poor" conditions



4. Low educational attainment of parents indicated by termination of parents' education by or before second year in high school

While the above characteristics were typically associated with culturally deprived families, other studies revealed that the characteristics and conditions of deprived families needed to be evaluated in each community if meaningful local programs were to be planned. Home visits were found to be an exceptionally successful method of obtaining the information necessary to understand these families. Other methods failed to reach these families because of their relative isolation from mass media, the absence of telephones, and their general lack of participation in school and community activities.

Surveys and interview schedules previously used in large scale research projects provided the basis for the instrument used in this study.

No study of culturally deprived families in Stillwater was found. This study was designed to examine the factors noted above in relation to a sample of families eligible for the Stillwater Project Head Start. Specifically, it compared the frequency of these familial factors in eligible families who enrolled their child with the frequency of eligible families who did not enroll their child.

## CHAPTER III

### METHODS AND PROCEDURES

#### Purpose

The purpose of this study was to describe and analyze the familial factors of those families who were eligible for and who enrolled their child in the Stillwater Project Head Start with those families who were eligible but did not enroll their child in the Project. The first of these groups of families will be referred to as the experimental group (E) and the second as the control group (C).

#### Hypotheses to be Tested

The null hypothesis was stated as follows: There is no significant difference between group E families and group C families in the frequency of observed selected familial factors. To facilitate analysis of the data, the summary of the review of literature (pp. 10-11) delineated the familial factors selected for study. These factors were stated in the following specific null hypotheses:

1. There is no significant difference in mobility patterns between group E and group C families.
2. There is no significant difference in the occupational level of the parents between group E and group C families.

3. There is no significant difference in the annual family income between group E and group C families.
4. There is no significant difference on educational attainment of the mothers and fathers between group E and group C parents.
5. There is no significant difference in the condition of housing between group E and group C families.
6. There is no significant difference in availability of sources of information between group E and group C families.
7. There is no significant difference in the number of families who initially were contacted about Stillwater Project Head Start between group E and group C families.

#### Subjects in this Study

The subjects in this study were forty families who would have a child enrolled in the first grade of the Stillwater Public School System beginning in the Fall of 1965. The families were selected on the basis of being eligible to participate in Stillwater Project Head Start during the Summer of 1965 (p. 2). The sample consisted of twenty eligible families who had a child enrolled, the experimental group E, and twenty eligible families who did not enroll their child in the Project, the control group C.

Families, considered eligible, were initially informed of Stillwater Project Head Start by means of a letter from the School System. A list of names of children eligible to participate in the Project was prepared from the teachers contacts with school age siblings of children who would be enrolled in the first grade in the Fall of 1965. Public Welfare

Caseworkers and the Public Health Nurse contacted families with whom they work, who would have a child enrolled in the first grade in the Fall, 1965, in an attempt to enroll more children who would benefit but who were not enrolled when the Project began. Further information was provided through newspaper and television channels.

#### Selection of Sample

Census tract data revealed that slum neighborhoods in metropolitan Northeastern states were identified by high population density per block and per dwelling unit. (8, 20). Areas of highest population density in Stillwater, however, consisted primarily of housing facilities for students at Oklahoma State University. (22). Families with children to be enrolled in first grade living in these areas were not considered culturally deprived even though their annual income may be low. Population density and income were considered important, however, these were not used as the sole criteria of "deprived families" in Stillwater.

Riessman (24), and Sexton (27) pointed out that culturally deprived families typically live in neighborhoods where the housing was rated as being of low quality and deteriorated maintenance. This criteria was used as the determining factor in the selection of families considered culturally deprived and therefore eligible to enroll their child in Stillwater Project Head Start. A map of a 1959 housing study (33) rated the condition of housing in Stillwater. This showed that housing rated as "poor condition" to "moderate condition" was concentrated South of Ninth Street and East of Adams Street. The review of literature indicated that families living in relatively expensive houses

which were in good repair would have a family income of more than \$3,000 to \$4,000 and therefore would not be eligible for Project Head Start. The sample studied lived in an area South of Ninth Street and East of Adams Street extending to the City Limits.

The school census taken in the Spring of 1965 provided a list of names and addresses, by school district, of those families who would have a child enrolled in the first grade in the Stillwater Public School System beginning September of 1965. These addresses were plotted on a map of Stillwater. The addresses of children enrolled in the Project were plotted, those living in the designated area were interviewed. Twenty families meeting similar criteria in this area, who had not enrolled their child, were studied for comparison.

#### Development of Interview Schedule

The review of literature served to delineate familial factors significant to the present study (pp. 10-11). The questions were designed to yield the following information:

1. Description of family members by age, sex, relationship to mother, marital status, and principle activity.
2. Description of the children's day, who cared for them, where the care was provided, and available outdoor play space
3. Place of birth and mobility patterns of the parents.
4. Number of inhabitants in relation to the number of rooms in the house, and the amount spent on housing each month.
5. Occupational level of parents.
6. Sources of family income, including annual family income.

7. Educational attainment of parents.

8. Index of cultural possessions.

Many of the questions used by the New York City Department of Health, in a Family Day Care Project (12) were used in this interview schedule. The "Children's Activity Sheet" was the author's modification of a portion of the residential survey designed for the Wichita, Kansas Study. (30). "The Cultural Possessions Index" was based on a study by Sewell (26) who developed a scale for the measurement of socio-economic status of Oklahoma farm families. Socio-economic status was derived by assigning numerical scores to items on a "Material Possessions Index," "Cultural Possessions Index," and "Social Participation Index" each of which was a part of the Sewell study. (Appendix C, p. 50).

Four mothers who lived in the designated area and who had pre-school age children were randomly selected as the subjects in the pre-test of the initial schedule. The investigator found that the question referring to adult supervision of the children when they went to parks and playgrounds did not express the intended meaning. The question was changed from "Who goes with this child?" to "Does an adult go with this child? If so, who?" As no confusion was found in the meaning of the remaining questions they were included in the interview schedule. On May 19, 1965, four different mothers meeting the same criteria of those in the previous pretest were interviewed. All the questions proved to obtain the desired data. The interview schedule is presented in Appendix B, pp. 41-48.

### Procedure of Data Collection

The data for this study were collected in a personal interview with each mother. This method was selected for its value of face-to-face contact, described in the review of literature as being important in working with culturally deprived families. (11, 13, 15). Young's (32) description of the personal interview further supported the use of this method in the present study.

The personal interview allows the interviewer to go behind mere outward behavior, aids him in checking his external observations, and enables him to study motivations, emotional responses, and social processes as they are reflected in human experiences and social situations. (p. 207).

Cooperation of the mothers was necessary in obtaining information about their families. To elicit this cooperation, the interviewer attempted to make clear the value and importance of the study in such a way that it seemed sensible and useful to the subject. The same statement was used at each house to insure the consistency of approach among those interviewed. (Appendix A, p. 39). The interviewer explained that the information was to be used in a general way, that it was confidential, and that it was connected in no way to her child's school records. The investigator further explained that to insure the accurate representation of every family she would record the information during the interview. The interviewer was accepted at every household approached.

A description of the family was obtained by completing the "Household Enumeration Sheet" (Appendix B, p. 42). The "Children's Activity Sheet" (Appendix B, p. 43) was used to record who took care of each child at designated periods of the day, where this care was given, and

whether outdoor play space was available. The remaining questions were completed in a similar manner. By observation, the interviewer rated the condition of the house on a scale from "very good" to "very poor." The house was rated as "poor" if there were holes in the exterior or interior walls, if there were screens lacking at doors or windows, if the home was cluttered, or if there were faulty steps or porches at the entrance. When the conditions were more extreme the house was rated as "very poor."



## CHAPTER IV

### ANALYSIS OF DATA

The purpose of this study was to describe and analyze the familial factors of families who were eligible for and who enrolled their child in the Stillwater Project Head Start (group E) with those families who were eligible but did not enroll their child in the Project (group C).

The data collected consisted of frequencies of observed factors which were classified in discrete categories. As discussed by Siegel (28), this property of the data influenced the selection of the Chi-Square test to determine any significant differences between the two groups. (pp. 106-116). The results are presented below.

Data for the groups were summarized in Table VIII, Appendix D, pp. 52-54, to provide a description of the total sample.

#### Mobility Patterns

Is there a statistically significant relationship between mobility patterns and enrollment in Stillwater Project Head Start? The number of moves made by families in each group within the past two years and the past five years, as well as the length of residence at the present address were studied.

Group E families were significantly less mobile during the past two years than were group C families. This difference was significant

at the .02 level as shown in Table I. No significant difference was noted when mobility during the previous five years was studied. A significantly higher proportion of group E families had lived at their present address a year or more than had group C families.

TABLE I

MOBILITY PATTERNS OF FAMILIES OF CHILDREN ELIGIBLE FOR  
STILLWATER PROJECT HEAD START, SUMMER OF 1965

	Group E f* Per Cent (N=20)		Group C f Per Cent (N=20)	
Times Moved Within Past Two Years: <sup>1</sup>				
Two or Less	18	90	10	50
Three or More	2	10	10	50
Times Moved Within Past Five Years: <sup>2</sup>				
Two or Less	10	50	7	35
Three or More	10	50	13	65
Length of Residence at Present Address: <sup>3</sup>				
Less than One Year	3	15	10	50
One to Five Years	13	65	8	40
More than Five Years	4	20	2	10

$$^1X^2 = 5.833; p = <.02$$

$$^2X^2 = .920; n.s.$$

$$^3X^2 = 7.29; p = <.01$$

\*f is the frequency of observed occurrences.

On the basis of these findings, null hypothesis 1 (p. 11), "There is no significant difference in mobility patterns between group E and group C families," was rejected.

## Occupational Level of Parents

Is there a relationship between the occupational level of the parents and enrollment in Stillwater Project Head Start? The occupations were classified according to the categories used by Hollingshead (18, p. 459).

TABLE II

OCCUPATIONAL LEVEL OF PARENTS OF CHILDREN ELIGIBLE FOR  
STILLWATER PROJECT HEAD START, SUMMER OF 1965

	<u>E</u> Mother f (N=20)	<u>C</u> Mother f (N=20)	<u>E</u> Father f (N=17)	<u>C</u> Father f (N=17)
Not Employed	11	13	0	2
Employed (Total)	9	7	17	15
Farm Labor	0	0	3	2
Household and Service	7	5	10	7
Craftsman and Laborer	0	0	4	6
Clerical and Saleswork	0	2	0	0
Professional and Business	2	0	0	0

The Chi-Square test was not considered as a reliable measure of differences because several of the categories contained a frequency of less than five. However, the two groups appeared to be similar in that one-half to three-fourths of the employed parents were engaged in work categorized as "household or service."

These findings indicate that the occupational level of parents in both groups were of low status. This similarity between the groups permits acceptance of null hypothesis 2 (p. 11), "There is no significant

difference in the occupational level of the parents between group E and group C families.

### Annual Family Income

Is there a relationship between annual family income and enrollment in Stillwater Project Head Start? Table III represents the results of this comparison.

TABLE III

ANNUAL FAMILY INCOME OF FAMILIES OF CHILDREN ELIGIBLE FOR  
STILLWATER PROJECT HEAD START, SUMMER OF 1965

	<u>Group E</u> f Per Cent (N=20)		<u>Group C</u> f Per Cent (N=20)	
\$3,000 or Less	5	25	9	45
\$3,000 to \$5,000	13	65	11	55
\$5,000 and Above	2	10	0	0

$$\chi^2 = 3.88; p = < .05$$

Significantly more group E families had an annual income of \$3,000 or more than did group C families. The occupational level of the parents (p. 21) and the mean family size (Appendix D, Table VIII, p. 52) are similar for both groups. Further examination of the data revealed that forty per cent of group E families were supported by the wages of both parents as compared to fifteen per cent of the group C families.

On the basis of these results, null hypothesis 3 (p. 13), "There

is no significant difference in the annual family income between group E and group C families," was rejected.

#### Educational Attainment of Parents

Is there a relationship between the educational attainment of parents and enrollment in Stillwater Project Head Start? Educational attainment below tenth grade was compared with that of tenth grade and above of the fathers and mothers in groups E and C. These results are presented in Table IV.

TABLE IV

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT OF PARENTS OF CHILDREN ELIGIBLE FOR  
STILLWATER PROJECT HEAD START, SUMMER OF 1965

	<u>E</u> Mother f (N=20)	<u>C</u> Mother f (N=20)	<u>E</u> Father f (N=17)	<u>C</u> Father f (N=17)
Ninth Grade and Below	2	9	4	6
Tenth Grade and Above	18	11	13	11
Mean Grade Completed	10.7	9.7	10.1	9.8

(Mothers)  $X^2 = 6.50$ ;  $p = < .02$   
(Fathers)  $X^2 = 1.25$ ; n.s.

Significantly more group E mothers completed at least the tenth grade than did mothers in group C. No significant statistical difference was found between the educational attainment of group E and group C fathers.

These results do not permit complete acceptance or rejection of

null hypothesis 4 (p. 13), "There is no significant difference on educational attainment of the mother and father between group E and group C families. However, the mean grade completed by the mothers and fathers in both groups indicated that their education was terminated before the second year in high school.

#### Housing Conditions

Is there a difference in the housing conditions between the groups studied? The rating of the houses in which group E and group C families live is presented in Table V.

TABLE V

HOUSING CONDITIONS OF FAMILIES WITH CHILDREN ELIGIBLE FOR  
STILLWATER PROJECT HEAD START, SUMMER OF 1965

	<u>Group E</u>		<u>Group C</u>	
	f	Per Cent	f	Per Cent
	(N=20)		(N=20)	
Conditions:				
Good	3	15	1	5
Fair	4	20	4	20
Poor	9	45	10	50
Very Poor	4	20	5	25

Seventy-five per cent of the housing was rated as "poor" or "very poor" for both groups. The small sample size limited the use of statistical computations, however, the groups appeared to be similar in condition of their housing. Null hypothesis 5 (p. 13), "There is no significant difference in the condition of housing between group E and group C families," was not accepted on the basis of these observations.

## Sources of Information

Is there a relationship between the groups in the availability of newspapers, magazines, books, television, and telephones? Table VI was compiled to present the data studied.

TABLE VI

AVAILABILITY OF SOURCES OF INFORMATION IN FAMILIES OF CHILDREN  
ELIGIBLE FOR STILLWATER PROJECT HEAD START, SUMMER OF 1965

	<u>Group E</u> f Per Cent (N=20)		<u>Group C</u> f Per Cent (N=20)	
Magazines Available in the Home:				
0 - 1	18	90	20	100
2 - 3	1	5	0	0
4 - 5	1	5	0	0
Daily Newspaper <sup>1</sup>	12	60	8	40
Books in the Home:				
0 - 7	17	85	18	90
8 - 49	3	15	2	10
Television	20	100	19	95
Telephone <sup>2</sup>	10	50	2	10

$$^1\chi^2 = .90; \text{ n.s.}$$

$$^2\chi^2 = 5.42; p = <.05$$

Only two families in the total sample had more than one magazine regularly available in the home and these were in group E. One-half of the total sample had access to the daily newspaper. Eight books or more were observed in only one out of eight families. All but one of the families studied owned a television. There were no statistically significant differences between the groups in these factors. Less than

one-third of the total sample had telephones, this difference was significant at the .05 level. Of this, twenty-five per cent of the telephones were in group E homes as compared with five per cent being in group C homes.

The data indicated that the only significant difference in availability of sources of communication was the possession of a telephone. Therefore, null hypothesis 6 (p. 13), "There is no significant difference in availability of sources of information between group E and group C families," was accepted.

#### Initial Contact Regarding Project

##### Head Start

Is there a relationship between the method in which the eligible families were introduced to Stillwater Project Head Start?

TABLE VII

INITIAL CONTACT REGARDING PROJECT HEAD START OF FAMILIES  
OF CHILDREN ELIGIBLE FOR THE STILLWATER PROJECT,  
SUMMER OF 1965

	<u>Group E</u> f Per Cent (N=20)		<u>Group C</u> f Per Cent (N=20)	
Letter from School	20	100	20	100
Personally Contacted	16	80	1	5

$$\chi^2 = 10.59; p = < .01$$

All families interviewed received a letter from the Stillwater School System inviting their child to participate in the Project.



Eighty per cent of group E parents were personally contacted, prior to the beginning of the Project, about enrolling their child. They were contacted by the principal or a teacher from the school their child would be attending in the Fall. One group C mother reported that she was informed of the Project by the Public Welfare Caseworker, prior to the beginning of the project.

Therefore, null hypothesis 7 (p. 13), "There is no significant difference in the number of families who were initially contacted personally about Stillwater Project Head Start between group E and group C families," was rejected.

#### Summary

The results of the statistical analysis of the data gathered in this research were:

1. Families of children enrolled in the Project were significantly less mobile during the past two years than were the families of children not enrolled. This difference was significant at the .02 level. A significantly higher proportion of families of enrolled children had lived at their present address a year or more than had the families of children enrolled.
2. No significant difference was found in the occupational level of the parents between the groups. The occupational levels appeared to be similar for both groups in that one-half to three-fourths of the employed parents were engaged in work categorized as "household or service."
3. Significantly more families of children enrolled in the Project

had an annual income of \$3,000 or more than did families of children not enrolled. This difference was significant at the .05 level. Forty per cent of the families of children enrolled in the Project were supported by the wages of both parents as compared to fifteen per cent of the families of children not enrolled.

4. Significantly more mothers of children enrolled in the Project completed at least the tenth grade than did mothers of children not enrolled. No significant statistical difference between the groups in the fathers' educational attainment was noted.
5. There was no significant difference in the condition of housing between families of enrolled children and families of children not enrolled in the Project. Seventy-five per cent of the total housing was rated as "poor" or "very poor."
6. There was no significant difference in availability of sources of information between families of enrolled children and families of children not enrolled, except in the possession of a telephone, which was significant at the .05 level.
7. Significantly more families of enrolled children were personally contacted about enrolling this child in the Project, prior to its beginning. This was significant at the .01 level.

## CHAPTER V

### SUMMARY

The purpose of this study was to describe and analyze the familial factors of those families who were eligible for and who enrolled their child in the Stillwater Project Head Start with those families who were eligible but did not enroll their child in the Project.

The sample for this study consisted of families eligible to participate in Stillwater Project Head Start, Summer of 1965. They lived in an area of Stillwater designated by housing of low quality and sub-standard maintenance. Within the sample of forty families were twenty eligible families who had enrolled their child in Project Head Start and twenty eligible families who had not enrolled their child in the Project. Information on selected familial factors was obtained in an interview with the mother in each of these families.

The Chi-Square test was used in data analysis. A description of the total sample was summarized in Appendix D, pp. 52-55.

### Findings

1. Families of children enrolled in the Project were significantly less mobile during the past two years than were the families of children not enrolled. This difference was significant at the .02 level. A significantly higher proportion of families of

enrolled children had lived at their present address a year or more than had the families of children not enrolled.

2. No significant difference was found in the occupational level of the parents between the groups. The occupational levels appeared to be similar for both groups in that one-half to three-fourths of the employed parents were engaged in work categorized as "household or service."
3. Significantly more families of children enrolled in the Project had an annual income of \$3,000 or more than did families of children not enrolled. This difference was significant at the .05 level. Forty per cent of the families of children enrolled in the Project were supported by the wages of both parents as compared to fifteen per cent of the families of children not enrolled.
4. Significantly more mothers of children enrolled in the Project completed at least the tenth grade than did mothers of children not enrolled. No significant statistical difference between the groups in the fathers' educational attainment was noted.
5. There was no significant difference in the condition of housing between families of enrolled children and families of children not enrolled. Seventy-five per cent of the total housing was rated as "poor" or "very poor."
6. There was no significant difference in availability of sources of information between families of enrolled children and families of children not enrolled, except in the possession of a telephone, which was significant at the .05 level.

7. Significantly more families of enrolled children were personally contacted about enrolling their child in the Project, prior to its beginning. This was significant at the .01 level.

#### Implications

Across the United States, there was a severe shortage of time for the development of Project Head Start. The local programs would have benefited by additional time which would have allowed more careful planning with other community resources. However, the planning for future enrichment programs will be supplemented by information gained from conscientious evaluation of Project Head Start, Summer of 1965.

This study indicated that culturally deprived parents were willing to cooperate and would discuss their family background and situation when the goal was to improve educational opportunities for their child. "Lack of cooperation" should not be used as an excuse to avoid development of such a program in the future.

Personal contacts were found to be very effective in encouraging enrollment of children in this enrichment program. Contacts of this type should be incorporated in all projects designed for culturally deprived groups.

Cultural deprivation is a composite of many factors. Lower educational attainment, poorer housing, lower annual income, higher mobility, and less sources of communication all combine to make for the continuation of the cycle of deprivation.

No one approach will provide all the answers to the questions about families considered culturally deprived. Therefore, personnel involved

in these Projects, and other community agencies and programs should be able to cooperate as they seek to assist these families and their children.

#### Recommendations for Further Research

The investigator makes the following recommendations for further research related to this study.

1. Develop a questionnaire to include a study of the attitudes parents have about their own schooling and schooling for their children.
2. Involve parents of children enrolled in the enrichment program in evaluation of its effect on their child.
3. A larger sample of culturally deprived families in Stillwater and other locales would be significant in eliminating unrecognized biases present in small samples.

# SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Barzun, Jacques. House of Intellect. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1959, pp. 140-148.
2. Braziel, William and Mary Terrell. "An Experiment in the Development of Readiness in a Culturally Disadvantaged Group of First Grade Children." Journal of Negro Education, XXXI (Winter, 1964).
3. Conant, James B. Slums and Suburbs. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1961.
4. Daniel, Walter G. "Editorial Comment." The Journal of Negro Education, XXXI (Winter, 1964), pp. 203-209.
5. Day Care Services, Form and Substance: A Report of a Conference November 17-18, 1960. Children's Bureau #393-1961, Women's Bureau #281-1961, Washington: Government Printing Office, 1961.
6. Della-Dora, Delmo. "Culturally Disadvantaged: Further Observations." Exceptional Children, XXIX (January, 1963), pp. 226-236.
7. Deutsch, Martin. "Facilitating Development in the Preschool Child: Social and Psychological Perspectives." Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, (Spring, 1964), pp. 249-263.
8. An Early School Admissions Project, Progress Report, 1963-1964. A Report Prepared by the Baltimore City Public Schools. Baltimore, Maryland: Baltimore City Public Schools, 1964.
9. Educational Policies Commission of National Education Association. "Education and the Disadvantaged American." NEA Journal, LI (April, 1962), pp. 9-12.
10. Eells, Kenneth. Intelligence and Cultural Difference. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961, p. 43.
11. Epstein, Lenore A. "Some Effects of Low Income on Children and Their Families." Social Security Bulletin, XXIV (February, 1961), pp. 12-17.

12. Family Day Care Project: Magnitude and Scope of Family Day Care in New York City. A Report Prepared by the New York City Department of Health. New York City: New York City Public Schools, 1964.
13. Fusco, Gene C. "School-Home Partnership in Depressed Urban Neighborhoods." Office of Education Bulletin. No. 20, OE 31009, Washington: Government Printing Office, 1964.
14. \_\_\_\_\_. "These Mistakes Can Weaken Preschool Programs." Nations Schools, LXXV (April, 1965), pp. 55-56.
15. Hartman, Allan. "How to Start a Preschool Program Without Waiting." Nations Schools, LXXV (April, 1965), pp. 52-53.
16. Havighurst, Robert J. "The Overlooked Positives of Disadvantaged Groups." Journal of Negro Education, XXXI (Winter, 1964), pp. 210-217.
17. \_\_\_\_\_. "Who are the Social Disadvantaged?" Journal of Negro Education, (Winter, 1964), pp. 225-231.
18. Hollingshead, A. B. Elmtown's Youth. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1949.
19. Keller, Suzanne. "The Social World of the Urban Slum Child: Some Early Findings." American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, XXXIII (1963).
20. McCormick, Thomas C. and Roy G. Francis. Methods of Research in the Behavioral Sciences. New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1958.
21. Metropolitan Comprehensive Plan Report for the City of Stillwater, Oklahoma. Prepared by the Business Extension Service, Oklahoma State University, 1961.
22. Mukundarao, Kathirisetti. "Perceptions of Community Need and Its Resolution: A Case Study of a Community Effort to Protect its Neglected Children." Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1963.
23. Olson, L. C. "The Effects of Non-public School Kindergarten Experience upon Pupils in First Grade." Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, 1962.
24. Riessman, Frank. The Culturally Deprived Child. New York: Harper and Row, 1962.
25. Sawrey, J. M. and C. W. Telford. Educational Psychology. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1958, p. 294.



26. Sewell, W. H. "The Construction and Standardization of a Scale for the Measurement of the Socio-Economic Status of Oklahoma Farm Families." Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, Agricultural Experiment Station, Technical Bulletin, #9, April 1, 1940.
27. Sexton, Patricia. Education and Income. New York: Viking Press, 1961.
28. Siegel, Sidney. Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1965, pp. 104-116, pp. 196-202.
29. Passow, Harry A. Education in Depressed Areas. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1963.
30. Wiener, Jack. Survey Methods for Determining the Need for Service To Children of Working Mothers. United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1956.
31. Working Mothers and Day Care Services in the United States, Facts About Children. United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Social Security Administration, Children's Bureau. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1962.
32. Young, Pauline V. Scientific Social Survey and Research. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1956, pp. 205-221.

#### OTHER SOURCES

1. "Housing Conditions in Stillwater, Oklahoma, 1959." A Map Prepared by Oklahoma State University Geology Department, Stillwater, Oklahoma, 1959.

## APPENDIXES

## APPENDIX A

## INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT

Hello, Mrs. "Doe," I'm Miss Persson with the University. I've been working with the Public School System here. Were interested in the children in Stillwater before they are old enough to go to school. We're hoping that we can obtain information that will be useful in organizing more nursery schools or kindergartens here. "Jonnie" will be going to the first grade this fall. Would you be so kind as to help us and answer these questions?

## APPENDIX B

**SURVEY OF  
YOUNG CHILDREN  
in  
STILLWATER, OKLAHOMA**

**Family Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Address:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Schedule #** \_\_\_\_\_





[illegible]

# \_\_\_\_\_

Survey of Young Children  
in  
Stillwater, Oklahoma

(Information entered on Household Enumeration Sheet)

1. First, I'd like to be sure that we have the right picture of your family. Your full name is?
  - a. What other family members live here?
  - b. What is their relationship to you?
  - c. What is your birthdate, and that of each of these people?
  - d. What is the sex of each of these people?
  - e. Which of these categories fit you? Are you married (1), separated (2), divorced (3), widowed (4), single (5). (Obtain for each adult.)
  - f. Have you ever been married before, how many times?
  - g. Has your husband ever been married before, how many times?
  - h. Can you tell me what each of these people is doing? Are they working (1), not working (2), school (3), retired (4), or other (5).

We're interested in what the children do during the day. Let us go over a usual day for them. (Give respondent card #1)  
(Information entered on Child's Activity Sheet.)

4. Who was caring for each child at these times?
  - a. To what days of the week does this apply?
  - b. If care was not given at home, indicate where it was given.
5. Where is there outdoor play space?
  - a. If playground or park, how near is it?
    1. less than 1 block
    2. 1 to 2 blocks
    3. 3 to 5 blocks
    4. 5 blocks or more
  - b. Does an adult go with this child, if so, who?
    1. no
    2. yes

That's fine, now we'll be talking about your schooling.

(Information entered on Household Enumeration Sheet.)

6. What was the highest grade you completed in school?
  - a. Has there been any other kind of schooling or training?
    1. no
    2. yes
  - b. If yes, ask: what kind? \_\_\_\_\_
    1. vocational
    2. trade
    3. business
    4. other
  - c. And your husband? What was the highest grade he completed?
  - d. Has there been any other kind of schooling or training?
    1. no
    2. yes
  - e. If yes, ask: what kind? \_\_\_\_\_
    1. vocational
    2. trade
    3. business
    4. other

I'm going to ask you now about the places you have lived.

7. Where were you born? \_\_\_\_\_
  - a. If applicable: And your husband? \_\_\_\_\_

# \_\_\_\_\_

## Survey of Young Children In Stillwater, Oklahoma

	Response	Code
8. How long have you lived in Stillwater?		_____
1. less than 1 year	_____	
2. 1 to 2 years	_____	
3. 3 to 4 years	_____	
4. 5 to 10 years	_____	
5. 10 years or more	_____	
9. Where did you live most of your life before coming to Stillwater?		_____
10. How long have you lived at this address? _____	_____	_____
11. Where were you living a year ago? _____	_____	_____
a. How many moves have you made in the past 2 years?	_____	_____
b. How many moves have you made in the past 5 years?	_____	_____
12. How many rooms are there here?	_____	_____
a. How many rooms are used for sleeping?	_____	_____
13. How much rent are you paying monthly?		_____
1. less than \$35.00	_____	
2. \$35 - \$50	_____	
3. \$50 - \$75	_____	
a. Do you own your own home? (If applicable.)		_____
1. no                      2. yes	_____	
b. If yes, what are the monthly payments?	_____	_____
14. Do you work outside of your home?	_____	_____
1. no                      2. yes	_____	
15. What kind of work do you do now? _____	_____	_____
a. What are the hours you work?		_____
_____ am to _____ am		
_____ pm to _____ pm		
1 b. How many months have you worked in the past year?	_____	_____
c. What days of the week do you work?	_____	_____
16. In what group is your income before deductions and taxes? (Card II)		_____
Weekly Income		
1. Under \$39	_____	
2. \$40 - 54	_____	
3. 55 - 69	_____	
17. Have you ever worked outside the home since you have had children?		_____
1. no                      2. yes	_____	
18. What kind of work did you do? _____	_____	_____
19. Why did you stop working? _____	_____	_____

## Survey of Young Children in Stillwater, Oklahoma

Response

Code

If husband is living in the home omit #20 - 21, proceed with # 22.

FOR MOTHERS WHOSE HUSBANDS ARE NOT LIVING IN THE HOME:

20. Are there any other sources of income--that is besides yours?

1. no                      2. yes

If the answer is yes:

a. Are these from other people?

1. husband/children's father  
2. children  
3. other relatives  
4. non-relative, roomer  
5. other (specify)

b. From other sources?

1. social security  
2. pension  
3. unemployment insurance  
4. public assistance  
5. other (specify)

c. How much is the income from these sources?

21. Fill in total annual income category after interview.

IF HUSBAND IS IN THE HOME:

22. What kind of work does your husband do?

a. How long has he had this job?

1. 5 years or more  
2. 3 - 5 years  
3. 1 - 2 years  
4. less than 1 year

b. Is it a steady job?

1. no                      2. yes

23. In what group is his income before deductions and taxes? (Card II)

Weekly Income

1. Under \$ 39.00  
2. \$40 - \$54  
3. 55 - 69

24. If presently unemployed, ask: What is his usual occupation?

25. How long has he been out of work?

1. less than 1 month  
2. 1 - 6 months  
3. 6 - 12 months  
4. more than 1 year

## Survey of Young Children in Stillwater, Oklahoma

	Response	Code
26. If handicapped, disabled, retired, or other specify condition and note how long condition existed? What is his condition?		_____
1. permanent disability	_____	
2. temporary disability	_____	
3. other (specify)	_____	
a. How long has he been this way?		_____
1. less than 1 year	_____	
2. 1 - 2 years	_____	
3. 2 - 5 years	_____	
4. more than 5 years	_____	
27. Are there any other sources of income-- that is besides yours and your husbands'?		_____
1. no                      2. yes	_____	
a. If yes, are these from other people?		_____
1. children	_____	
2. relatives	_____	
3. non-related roomer	_____	
4. other (specify)	_____	
b. Other sources?		_____
1. social security	_____	
2. pensions	_____	
3. unemployment insurance	_____	
4. public assistance	_____	
5. other (specify)	_____	
28. Fill in total annual family income after interview.		_____
29. If it were found to be necessary to clarify some of this information may someone call on you again?		_____
1. no                      2. yes	_____	

That's it! Thank you so much for your cooperation.

## Survey Of young Children in Stillwater, Oklahoma # \_\_\_\_\_

## Cultural Possessions Index

	Response	Code
1. Observe: type of housing	_____	_____
1. one-family house	_____	
2. two-family house	_____	
3. multiple dwelling	_____	
a. 1. apartment	_____	_____
2. house	_____	
3. garage apartment	_____	
4. other, (describe)	_____	
2. Observe: condition of housing	_____	_____
1. very good	_____	
2. good	_____	
3. fair	_____	
4. poor	_____	
5. very poor	_____	
3. Condition of play space;		_____
a. Location		
1. own yard	_____	
2. playground or park	_____	
3. none (street)	_____	
4. Living room floor covering:	_____	_____
1. Rugs or carpet	_____	
2. linoleum or bare	_____	
5. Shades and curtains or drapes on Living room windows?	_____	_____
6. Approximate number of books in home?	_____	_____
1. 0 - 7	_____	
2. 8 - 49	_____	
3. 50 - 99	_____	
4. 100 +	_____	
7. Number of magazines regularly taken?	_____	_____
1. 0 - 1	_____	
2. 2 - 3	_____	
3. 4 - 5	_____	
4. 6 +	_____	
8. Family takes a daily newspaper?	_____	_____
9. Radio?	_____	_____
10. T. V.?	_____	_____
11. Automobile (other than truck)	_____	_____
12. Telephone	_____	_____
13. Is your furniture insured?	_____	_____
14. Is breadwinner's life insured?	_____	_____
15. Race:		
1. white	_____	_____
2. negro		
3. other	_____	_____

## APPENDIX C

## II--CULTURAL POSSESSIONS INDEX

SCORE		SCORE	IF Y	N
___	1. Living room floor covering: Rugs or carpets      Linoleum or bare Score:    6                                  3			
___	2. Shades and curtains or drapes on L.R. windows?	5		2
___	3. Living room lounge: Divan, davenport, day bed or bed, cot, or studio couch      couch                  or none Score:    6                                  5                                  3			
___	4. Approximate number of books in the home? Number: 0-7    8-49    50-99    100 and up Score:    3        5        7            8			
___	5. Number of magazines regularly taken? Number: 0-1    2-3    4-5        6 and up Score:    3        5        7            8			
___	6. Family takes a daily newspaper?	6		3
___	7. Radio?	6		3
___	8. Automobile? (other than truck)	5		2
___	9. Telephone?	6		3
___	10. Husband's education? (grades completed) Number: 0-7    8        9-11    12    13 and up Score:    3        5        6        7        8			
___	11. Wife's education? (grades completed) Number: 0-7    8        9-11    12    13 and up Score:    2        4        6        7        8			
___	12. Furniture insured?	7		4
___	13. Husband's life insured?	6		3



## APPENDIX D

TABLE VIII  
DESCRIPTION OF SAMPLE

Factors	Categories	Responses		
		<u>Group E</u> f	<u>Group C</u> f	<u>Total</u> f
FAMILY				
Siblings	3 or Less	9	11	20
	4 or 5	8	6	14
	6 and Above	<u>3</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>6</u>
		20	20	40
	Mean	3.85	3.45	
Ordinal Position	Only Child	1	3	4
	First Born	2	4	6
	Last Born	5	7	12
	Next to Last	11	4	15
	Other	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>
		20	20	40
Marital Status (Father)	Married	17	17	34
	Remarriages			
	Once	3	2	5
	Twice	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>
		3	3	6
(Mother)	Married	17	17	34
	"Broken"			
	Separated	1	0	1
	Divorced	2	2	4
	Single	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>
	3	3	6	
(Mother)	Remarriages			
	Once	2	3	5
	Twice	1	1	2
	Over Twice	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>
	3	5	8	
Educational Attainment				
(Father)	Grammar School	1	0	1
	Jr. High	3	6	9
	10-11 Grade	10	8	18
	12 Grade	2	3	5
	Some College	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>
	17	17	34	

TABLE VIII (Continued)

Factors	Categories	Responses		
		<u>Group E</u> f	<u>Group C</u> f	<u>Total</u> f
Educational Attainment (Continued)				
(Mother)	Grammar School	0	2	2
	Jr. High	2	7	9
	10-11 Grade	12	7	19
	12 Grade	5	4	9
	Some College	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>
	20	20	40	
Hours Mother is Employed				
	8 a.m. - 5 p.m.	3	5	8
	8 a.m. - 12 n	3	0	3
	Irregular	2	1	3
	Other	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>
	9	7	16	
Months Mother Employed Since January, 1965				
	6	5	6	11
	3 - 5	3	1	4
	1 - 2	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>
	9	7	16	
Sources of Income				
	Mother Only	2	4	6
	Father Only	9	12	21
	Both Mother & Father	7	3	10
	Other Sources			
	Husband/Father	2	2	4
	Public Assistance	1	0	1
	Social Security	0	1	1
	Unemployment Insurance	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>
	21	24	45	
Annual Family Income				
	Less than \$2,000	0	1	1
	\$2,000 - \$3,000	5	8	13
	\$3,000 - \$4,000	8	7	15
	Above \$4,000	<u>7</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>11</u>
	20	20	40	
Length of Husband's Unemployment				
	Less than 1 Month	0	1	1
	6 - 12 Months	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>
	0	2	2	

TABLE VIII (Continued)

Factors	Categories	Responses		
		<u>Group E</u> f	<u>Group C</u> f	<u>Total</u> f
MOBILITY				
Home State (Father)	Stillwater	5	1	6
	Oklahoma	10	10	20
	Middle Atlantic	1	0	1
	Southern States	<u>1</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>
		17	17	34
(Mother)	Stillwater	6	3	9
	Oklahoma	12	7	19
	Middle Atlantic	2	3	5
	Southern States	0	6	6
	Western States	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>
	20	20	40	
Time at Present Address	Less than 1 Year	3	10	13
	1 - 2 Years	9	5	14
	3 - 5 Years	4	3	7
	5 - 10 Years	4	1	5
	More than 10 Years	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>
	20	20	40	
HOUSING				
Type of Housing	One-family	19	19	38
	Two-family	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>
		20	20	40
Living Room Condition	Rugs	0	1	1
	Lineoleum or Bare	<u>20</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>39</u>
		20	20	40

TABLE IX

CHILD CARE PATTERNS IN FAMILIES OF CHILDREN ELIGIBLE FOR STILLWATER  
PROJECT HEAD START, SUMMER OF 1965

Age:		Under 6		7 - 11		12 - 14		15 - 17	
Groups:		<u>E</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>E</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>E</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>E</u>	<u>C</u>
N:		40	34	24	18	8	8	5	4
Mother	Child's Home	29	22	15	13	5	5	4	2
Father	Child's Home	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0
Relative Under 16 Years	Child's Home	2	3	3	0	0	0	0	0
	Relative's Home	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Relative Over 16 Years	Child's Home	2	2	3	2	0	2	0	2
	Relative's Home	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Babysitter	Child's Home	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Neighbor	Child's Home	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0
No Special Supervision		2	0	2	1	3	1	1	0

TABLE X

AVAILABILITY OF OUTDOOR PLAY SPACE TO FAMILIES OF CHILDREN  
ELIGIBLE FOR STILLWATER PROJECT HEAD START,  
SUMMER OF 1965

Age:		Under 6		7 - 11		12 - 14		15 - 17	
Groups:		<u>E</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>E</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>E</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>E</u>	<u>C</u>
N:		40	34	24	18	8	8	5	4
Own Yard		40	34	24	18	8	8	5	4
Distance to Park:									
Not Available		0	2	0	1	0	1	0	0
Less than 1 Block		3	2	7	2	0	1	1	2
1 - 2 Blocks		13	9	8	3	2	1	2	0
3 - 5 Blocks		5	5	2	3	1	1	1	0
6 - 7 Blocks		0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0
More than 7 Blocks		19	14	7	8	5	4	1	2
Supervision:									
None		25	25	9	9	5	4	2	3
Parent		9	4	12	7	2	4	2	1
Other		6	5	3	2	1	0	1	0

## VITA

Suzanne A. Persson

Candidate for the Degree of  
Master of Science

Thesis: STUDY OF FAMILIAL FACTORS OF FAMILIES WITH CHILDREN ELIGIBLE  
FOR AN ENRICHMENT PROGRAM

Major Field: Family Relations and Child Development

### Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Champaign, Illinois, August 12, 1942,  
the daughter of Frank B. and Mae Persson.

Education: Attended grade school in Debuque and Marshalltown,  
Iowa, and Tulsa, Oklahoma; was graduated from Edison High  
School, Tulsa, Oklahoma in 1960; attended Stephens College  
in Columbia, Missouri during 1960-1961 school year; re-  
ceived the Bachelor of Science Degree from Oklahoma State  
University with a major in Home Economics Education, in  
May, 1964; completed requirements for the degree of Master  
of Science in Family Relations and Child Development in  
May, 1966.

Professional Experience: Caseworker Trainee for Tulsa County  
Department of Public Welfare during summer of 1964; nursery  
school assistant in the Department of Family Relations and  
Child Development at Oklahoma State University during the  
Summer of 1965.

Professional and Honorary Organizations: American Home Economics  
Association, Southern Association of Children Under Six,  
Oklahoma Health and Welfare Association, Phi Upsilon Omnicron.